

## Remarks

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed April 24, 2008. Claims 21, 41, and 67 are amended. Claims 24, 41, and 45-67 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for the following reasons.

### I. Claim Rejections – Anderson and Duncan

In the Action, claims 24, 41, 45-61, and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,909,155, in view of Duncan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,459,571. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

#### Claim 24

Claim 24 recites, among other limitations, that the receptacle is defined through a raised platform located at an outer face of the front wall, and that the outer face is contoured such that the front wall has a greater thickness adjacent a mid-region of a width of the front wall as compared to side regions of the width.

One example of such a front wall is shown in Figures 15 and 16 of the present application. Receptacles 314-1 to 314-8 are defined through two raised, generally planar platforms 380 located at the front face of the front wall 316. The contoured configuration of the front wall 316 causes the front wall 316 to have a greater thickness at a mid-region of the width  $w$  as compared to the side regions of the width  $w$ . The contoured regions 386 provide a gradual transition between the raised platforms 380 and recessed side regions 385 of the front wall 316 such that the platforms 380 are thicker than the side regions 385.

The Office Action concedes that Anderson and Duncan fail to disclose such a configuration. Instead, the Office Action cites Fishman for disclosing the noted configuration. See pp. 8 and 9 of the Action. Fishman discloses an ornamental design for a cover for a television control panel.

Fishman fails to disclose or suggest that a receptacle is defined through a raised platform located at an outer face of the front wall, and that the outer face is contoured such that the front wall has a greater thickness adjacent a mid-region of a width of the front wall as compared to side regions of the width, as required by claim 1. For example, the cover disclosed by Fishman

lacks any receptacles. Further, the Action fails to describe how or why one skilled in the art would incorporate the ornamental design for the television cover into the telecommunication modules disclosed by Anderson and Duncan.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 24 are therefore requested.

#### Claim 41

Claim 41 recites, a non-metallic cover for covering the receptacle, wherein the cover has a transparent plastic construction.

It can be advantageous to use a transparent plastic cover so that a technician can readily read the pad values through the cover without requiring removal. Application, p. 14, ll. 32-33.

The Action states that it would have been obvious to make the cover disclosed by Anderson using non-metallic and plastic materials. However, such a modification cannot be made because the substitution of a plastic material for the metallic cover 100 disclosed by Anderson would render the cover unusable for its intended purpose for the following reasons. See MPEP 2143.01(V) (noting that, “[i]f proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification”). In Anderson, cover 100 is made of an electrically conductive material such as metal to provide adequate EMI shielding. Anderson, column 5, lines 22-33. If cover 100 is instead made of plastic, as suggested in the Action, cover 100 would not provide EMI shielding and would therefore be unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Consequently, there is no motivation to make the suggested substitution of plastic for the metal cover disclosed by Anderson.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 41 are therefore requested.

#### Claims 45-61 and 65

Claim 45 recites, in part, a receptacle being configured as a RF choke that chokes RF emissions generated within the housing to a level such that the module radiates signals that are 100 db down or better from a carrier across a frequency range of 5 megahertz to 1 gigahertz even in the absence of a cover over the receptacle.

The Action concedes that Anderson lacks such as disclosure. Action, p. 5. Duncan likewise fails to disclose such an attenuation. For example, Duncan discloses an attenuation of

about 12 db with a carrier wave of 2.488 gigahertz. Duncan, col. 9, ll. 6-13. Duncan therefore also fails to disclose signals that are 100 db down or better from a carrier across a frequency range of 5 megahertz to 1 gigahertz, as recited by claim 45.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 45, as well as claims 46-61 and 65 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

#### Claim 66

Claim 66 recites a receptacle including at least one guide surface for channeling the plug into the plug connector when the plug is inserted into the receptacle, the at least one guide surface being configured such that misalignment of the plug relative to the plug connector is not possible during the insertion process.

One example of such a guiding surface is shown in Figure 15 of the present application, in which the receptacles 314-1 to 314-8 each have a generally rectangular configuration and are defined by two opposing primary receptacle surfaces 377 and two opposing secondary receptacle surfaces 379. The major and minor surfaces 377, 379 of the receptacle walls function as guide surfaces for channeling the attenuator pads 290-1 to 290-8 into the pad connectors 336-1 to 336-8 during insertion of the attenuator pads 290-1 to 290-8. The receptacles 314-1 to 314-8 are preferably sized such that misalignment of the attenuator pads 290-1 to 290-8 relative to their corresponding connectors 336-1 to 336-8 is not possible during the insertion process.

The Action concedes that Anderson lacks such as disclosure. Action, p. 5. Duncan likewise fails to disclose such a configuration. For example, Duncan fails to disclose or suggest that the walls 18, 20, 22, 24 of the shield 10 perform as guides for the fiber optic cables 38.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 66 are requested.

#### Claim 67

Claim 67 recites, in part, placing a transparent plastic cover over the receptacle. As previously noted, Anderson cannot be modified to include a plastic cover because modification of Anderson to include a plastic cover would render the cover unusable for its intended purpose. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 67 are therefore requested.

II. Claim Rejections – Anderson, Duncan, and Fishman

Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Duncan and further in view of Fishman, U.S. Patent No. D440,558. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claims 62-64 depend from claim 45 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as those provided above for claim 45.

In addition, claims 62-64 further define over the art of record. For example, these claims recite the following limitations:

- claim 62 - the wall includes an outer face, and wherein the receptacle is defined through a raised platform located at the outer face;
- claim 63 - a cover for covering the receptacle, wherein the housing defines a slot that extends about a perimeter of the raised platform, and wherein the slot is sized to receive an edge of the cover; and
- claim 64 - the wall has a width, and wherein the outer face is contoured such that the wall has a greater thickness adjacent a mid-region of the width as compared to side regions of the width.

None of the art of record discloses or suggests such limitations. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

III. Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: September 24, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/  
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky  
Reg. No.: 50,471